



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Periode, erfüllt von Kriegsgedanken, gab das patriotische Drama; die Auflehnung gegen den Übermut des Adels predigte das erste bürgerliche Trauerspiel, und die Zeit der Religionsstreitigkeiten fand ihren Wiederhall in dem religiös-sittlichen Toleranzdrama. Was im kleinen Kreise bei Lessing der Fall gewesen, lässt sich auch auf die verschiedenen Perioden, die das deutsche Drama im allgemeinen durchlief, anwenden.

6. Eine Definition des Mitleidsbegriffes auf allgemeine Sätze aufzubauen, die sich in den theoretischen Abhandlungen einzelner Dichter vorfinden mögen, muss immer zu übertriebenen Verallgemeinerungen führen.

7. Der richtige Begriff des tragischen Mitleids lässt sich nur pragmatisch induktiv aus den anerkannten Meisterstücken einer gewissen Periode deduzieren.

8. Der Begriff des tragischen Mitleids kann keineswegs ohne weiteres von einer Periode auf eine andere übertragen werden; es würde dies, wie bereits erwähnt, zu falschen Folgerungen führen.

9. Der Begriff des tragischen Mitleids muss historisch-evolutionell und nicht absolut verstanden werden. Ein Entwicklungsgang, der verschiedene Schattierungen aufweist, lässt sich schon bei einzelnen Dichtern konstatieren. Wie viel mehr muss dies im Werdegang einer Literaturgattung der Fall sein!

10. Der Begriff des tragischen Mitleids jeder Periode ist dazu angetan, wichtige Aufschlüsse über das moralisch-ästhetische Wesen dieses Zeitabschnittes zu geben, da die Literatur im allgemeinen und das Drama im besonderen es sich zur Aufgabe macht, den jeweiligen moralisch-ästhetischen Ansichten des Leser- und Zuhörerkreises so nahe wie möglich zu kommen.

FRANCIS WALDEMAR KRACHER.

State University of Iowa.

# SOME NEW FACTS CONCERNING FIELDING'S *TUMBLE-DOWN DICK* AND *PASQUIN*

Lawrence (*Life of Fielding*, p. 376) dates *Tumble-Down Dick* "1737," and notes (p. 106) in connection with 1737 that the play "appears to have been specially aimed at Rich's harlequinade in an unsuccessful piece called 'The Fall of Phaeton,' acted at Drury Lane, in March, 1736." The tabular list of theatrical performances for each day of January and February, 1736, in *The Gentleman's Magazine* of February, 1736, page 98, and the list for March and April in the issue of April, 1736, page 234, show that the "Fall of Phaeton" was played at Drury Lane with the *Earl of Essex* on February 28 (see also advertisement, *London Daily Post*, February 28), and was also acted on March 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 16, 18, 27, 30, April 17, 26, 27, 28. According to the list of plays (stated to be based on Genest) at the end of the article on Fielding in *DNB.*, *Tumble-Down Dick* was first performed 1737. Mr. Dobson (*Fielding* ed. 1905, p. 56) says: "Besides these, there are three hasty and flimsy pieces which belong to the early part of 1737. The first of these, *Tumble-Down Dick*; or, *Phaeton in the Suds*, was a dramatic sketch in ridicule of the unmeaning Entertainments and Harlequinades of John Rich at Covent Garden." He adds: ". . . from the dedication [to *Tumble-Down Dick*] it appears that Rich had brought out an unsuccessful satire on *Pasquin* called *Marforio*." In the dedication, Fielding merely refers to a "satire," he does not give its name. The list of daily performances appended to the *Gentleman's Magazine* of April, 1736, p. 234, states that "All for Love, & *Marforio*" were acted at Covent Garden April 10th. *Marforio* seems to have failed, for it was not repeated during April. Baker's *Biographia Dramatica*, III, 19, states that *Marforio* was not printed. In the *Encycl. Brit.* (Edit. XI) s.v. *Fielding*, Mr. Dobson says: "*Tumble-Down Dick*; or, *Phaeton in the Suds*, *Eurydice* and *Eurydice hissed* are the names of three occasional pieces which

belong to the last months of Fielding's career as a Haymarket manager." These "last months," it will be recalled, ended with the summer of 1737. Miss Godden (*Henry Fielding, A Memoir*, p. 318) lists: "1744 *Tumble-Down Dick*, produced at the Little Theatre in the Haymarket." The publication of *Tumble-Down Dick* is not noticed in the Register of Books of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1736-1743 inclusive. In the Bibliography of First Editions in his edition of Fielding's *Works (Miscellaneous Writings, III, p. liii)* Henley says, under date "1737 or 1744":

"An advertisement in 'Pasquin', 1736, states, 'Shortly will be published TUMBLE DOWN DICK or PHAETON IN THE SUDS, a serious Pantomime now practising at the Haymarket Theatre.' Lawrence, in 1855, gives the date of publication as 1737. Roscoe, in 1840, states it was not acted until 1744; this is the date assigned to its publication in 'Theatrical Records' of 1756. The earliest copy in the Brit. Museum also bears date of 1744 and reads: . . ."

At the foot of the title-page of his reprint (*Plays and Poems V*) of the 1744 edition of *Tumble-Down Dick*, Henley noted "First Acted in 1744."

*Pasquin* is listed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* Register of Books of April, 1736, p. 235. The *London Daily Post* of Tuesday, April 6, 1736, advertises,

"Next Thursday will be publish'd, / (Having been already acted 26 Nights successively, and still / continues to be perform'd to crowded Audiences with Universal / Applause.) / PASQUIN; a Dramatick Satire on the Times: / . . . Written by Henry Fielding, Esq., / Printed for J. Watts, at the Printing Office in Wild / Court near Lincoln's Inn Fields . . ."

On Wednesday, April 7, the same paper has an advertisement like that of the 6th, except for the first line, which reads: "Tomorrow will be publish'd." These advertisements with their information as to the date of publication of *Pasquin*, have not hitherto been noted in print. On the reverse of the leaf in the 1736 edition of *Pasquin* that contains the announcement of *Tumble-Down Dick* (see above), is listed *Petronius Arbiter* dated "April 8, 1736." But the note from the *Prompter* quoted toward the end of this present article, suggests that *Pas-*

*quin* may actually not yet have been issued on April 9 or even April 10. Oddly there is in neither the *Daily Journal* nor the *Daily Post* any advertisement on April 8, the previously advertised date of publication; and there is no further advertisement of issue of *Pasquin* in any later April number of either of these papers.

Final statement of the actual date of first performance of *Pasquin*, has apparently not yet been made. Lawrence (p. 79) and Mr. Dobson (p. 45 f.) locate it in the spring of 1736. Miss Godden (p. 62) notes: "*Notitia Dramatica*, MSS. Dept. British Museum, speaks of *Pasquin* as performed for the fortieth time on April 21, 1736; and quotes an advertisement of the play for March 5. There seems to be no record of the actual first night." Miss Godden quotes part of an advertisement of March 5 (p. 67): "*By the Great Mogul's Company of English Comedians, Newly Imported*. At the New Theatre in the Haymarket, this Day, March 5, will be presented PASQUIN, . . ." Her quotation agrees in wording (even to the error in "the [sic] find belongs to 'em") with the opening of an advertisement of *Pasquin* in the *London Daily Post* of February 24, 1736, except that for "this Day, March 5," the earlier notice reads, "Friday, March 5." In the issues of the *London Daily Post* of March 1 and 3 is an advertisement identical with that of February 24, except for the substitution of "Friday next, March 5." The issue of March 4 has "Tomorrow" for "Friday next;" the issue of March 5 has at its head in large type "Haymarket," and "this Day" for "Friday next;" the issue of March 6 has "this Day, March 6." Further, the issue of March 8 (Monday) has "Haymarket. The Third Day . . . this Day, March 8, will be presented PASQUIN, . . .;" and the issues of March 9 and 10 announce "The Fourth Day" for the 9th and "The Fifth Day" for "Tomorrow, March 11." Clearly, then, *Pasquin* was performed for the first time on Friday, March 5, 1736.

The dedication signed "Pasquin" to John Lun (John Rich) prefaced to the 1744 edition of *Tumble-Down Dick* reprinted in Henley's

edition of Fielding's *Works*, speaks as if it were written, and as if it were to be printed, very shortly after the first success of *Pasquin*. It opens, "Though *Pasquin* has put dedications in so ridiculous a light, that patrons may, perhaps, pay some shame for the future for reading their own praises . . ." It refers to Rich's introduction of "Entertainments." Then in paragraph 3 it proceeds:

"But, sir, I have farther obligations to you than the success, whatever it be, which this little farce may meet with, can lay on me. It was to a play judiciously brought on by you in the May-month, to which I owe the original hint, as I have always owned, of the contrasted poets, and two or three other particulars, which have received great applause on the stage. Nor am I less obliged to you for discovering in my imperfect performance the strokes of an author, any of whose wit if I have preserved entire, I shall think it my chief merit to the town. . . . Farther, as *Pasquin* has proved of greater advantage to me, than it could have been at any other play-house, under their present regulations, I am obliged to you for the indifference you showed at my proposal to you of bringing a play on your stage this winter, which immediately determined me against any farther pursuing that project;"

and Fielding adds that he would not play the part of flatterer of the greatness that Rich assumed in private. He goes on:

"I am, moreover, much obliged to you for that satire on *Pasquin*, which you was so kind to bring on your stage; . . . I own it was a sensible pleasure to me to observe the town, which had before been so favourable to *Pasquin* at his own house, confirming that applause, by thoroughly condemning the satire on him at yours."

The next paragraph continues the discussion of Rich's satire on *Pasquin*.

The expression, "the success, whatever it be, which this little farce may meet with," undoubtedly refers to *Tumble-Down Dick*. It would seem to be used of a play not yet tried, or at utmost little tried, on the public. The play for which Fielding got "the original hint . . . of the contrasted poets" is evidently *Pasquin*, the poets being Fustian and Trapwit. It is true that "contrasted poets" Fustian and Machine appear in *Tumble-Down Dick*, but "the original hint" had been worked up in

*Pasquin*. Supporting the idea that this play is *Pasquin* is the statement that the poets and "two or three other particulars" borrowed from Rich's play, "have received great applause on the stage." The assumption is farther sustained by the phrasing of Fielding's statement "I have always owned" indebtedness to Rich for the suggestion of the poets, and by the next following sentence of the dedication, according to which Fielding's play in which the poets appear has already been criticised by Rich—situations that could not have been had not the play already been performed or printed at least some little time before the writing of the dedication.

*Tumble-Down Dick* was acted in 1736, and the first performance occurred on April 29. The following advertisement is from the *London Daily Post* of April 21, 1736:

"HAY-MARKET. / *The Fortieth Day.* / By The Great Mogul's Company of English Comedians, / Newly Imported. / AT the New Theatre in the Hay-Market, / Wednesday next, April 28, will be presented / PASQUIN / A Dramatick SATIRE on the Times. / To which will be added, / The Practice of a Dramatick Entertainment of Walking, in Serious / and Absurd Characters, call'd / TUMBLE-DOWN-DICK: / OR, PHAETON in the SUDS. / Interlarded with Foolish Comic Interludes, call'd / *Harlequin* a Pick-Pocket. / With New Scenes, and other Decorations. / Boxes 5s. . . ."

This same appeared in the issues of April 22, 24, 26. On the 27th *Pasquin* alone was announced for "this Day"; and at the end of the notice was printed in small type:

"To-morrow will be presented *Pasquin*, &c. To which will be added (never perform'd before) the Practice of a New Entertainment of Walking, in Serious and Absurd Characters, call'd *Tumble-Down-Dick*: or *Phaeton* in the Suds. Interlarded with foolish Comic Interludes, call'd *Harlequin* a Pick-Pocket. . . ."

But the first performance of *Tumble-Down Dick* was postponed to the 29th. The *London Daily Post* of April 28 advertised "The Forty first Day" of *Pasquin* for "To-morrow, April 29." The same advertisement announces *Tumble-Down Dick* as to be played on the 29th with *Pasquin*. The reason for the postponement of the new play is given in a note at the

end: "The Company being engaged in the Practice of the Entertainment, and, by reason of the Royal Wedding, expecting no Company but themselves, are obliged to defer playing 'till To-morrow." This last note is partly quoted by Miss Godden on her page 67. The play apparently was a success, for it was advertised to be performed with *Pasquin* on April 29, 30, May 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25; and with *Guilt Its Own Punishment* on May 27, 28, 29. Beyond this last date I have not followed the play.

When was *Tumble-Down Dick* first printed? The matter concerning *Pasquin*, the nature of the matter, the nature of the expression of it, and the giving over of a larger part of the dedication to it,—these elements of the dedication of *Tumble-Down Dick* taken together make up what might well have been introduced into a dedication intended to be published at about the time of the success of *Pasquin*, but would less probably have been introduced into one intended for issue a year (1737) or a number of years (1744) after the success of *Pasquin*. The expression of paragraph 3 of the dedication quoted above, ". . . the success, whatever it be, which this little farce may meet with, . . ." may well lead to belief that the dedication was written before, or at the very time of, the first performance of *Tumble-Down Dick*. In this dedication the play from which Fielding got the idea of "the contrasted poets" (apparently for *Pasquin*, see above) is said to have been "brought on by you [Rich] in the May-month." Evidently "the May-month" must have been May, 1735, for *Pasquin* (as we have seen) was advertised as early as February 24 and was played on March 5, 1736, and announced April 6 as to be printed April 8, 1736. From the nature of the expression "the May-month" it would appear that the dedication to *Tumble-Down Dick* was written after May, 1735, and at latest before May of the next year. The expression "the May-month" indicates also that Fielding intended the dedication, and so the play, to be read by the public before May, 1736. Further, as it deals with *Pasquin's* success, and mentions performance of Rich's satire on *Pasquin* (i. e., *Marforio*

played April 10), apparently the dedication was written after April 10, 1736. All this is supported by the advertisement (quoted above) in the printed edition of *Pasquin* announced as to be published April 8, 1736, that "Shortly will be published *Tumble-Down Dick* . . ." In view of what has just been said in this and the next preceding paragraph, one may conclude that the dedication was written probably in April, 1736, with the idea of publication in the same month.

Now, the advertisements of May 20, 22, 25, 1736, contain a list of the full cast of *Tumble-Down Dick*. Except for the omission of the Prompter in the advertisements, and substitution of Miss Ferguson for Miss Burgess as Genius of Gin, of Miss Roberts for Miss Ferguson as one of the Stars, of "Mademoiselle La Charmante, piping-hot from Paris," for Mddle. Beaumaunt as Columbine, of "Mons. D'Herbage" and "Mons. De la Soup-Maigre" as Countrymen in place of Mr. Lowden dropped, and failure to give the name of the actors of the Watchmen, this cast is identical with that reprinted by Henley as the cast of 1744. This leads to the conclusion that the 1744 edition is printed from a 1736 edition or from "copy" got up for a 1736 edition. This conclusion is supported by and supports the assertion that the dedication in the 1744 edition was, as it stands, hardly written for publication in 1744. Further, the 1744 title-page speaks of the play "As it is perform'd at the New Theatre in the Hay-Market," and has J. Watts's imprint. Long before this, Watts had ceased<sup>1</sup> to be Fielding's printer of new works.<sup>2</sup>

We have seen that on April 21, 1736, *Tumble-Down Dick* was advertised as to be acted

<sup>1</sup> See my note in *Modern Language Notes*, June, 1912.

<sup>2</sup> Since this article was accepted Mr. F. S. Dickson, the donor to Yale University of the Lounsbury collection of Fieldingiana, to whom I am indebted for many favors, has written me that he has in his possession a cutting from an old-book catalogue reading as follows: "119 Fielding (Henry), *Tumble-Down-Dick*, or *Phaeton in the Suds*, a Dramatick Entertainment, First Edition, 8vo, sewed (slightly cut), 5s. 6d. 1736." So apparently the play was printed in 1736.

April 28, and that in the edition of *Pasquin*, itself advertised on April 6 as to be issued April 8, it was advertised as "Shortly will be published." The play was, then, composed at least partly before April 6. It was written, moreover, in *anticipation* of Rich's *Marforio*. This the following body of new matter, which includes a general summary of this paper so far, will make apparent.

(1) In *Pasquin*, as the *Tumble-Down Dick* dedication admits, Fielding did use matter borrowed from Rich, *i. e.*, the "contrasted poets." (2) Fielding appealed to Rich to put on a play for him. (3) Evidently the "this winter" of the appeal is the winter of 1735-6, for in 1736-7 Fielding had his own theatre, and in *Pasquin* and *Tumble-Down Dick* of 1736 he attacked Rich violently. (4) As the expression directly shows, the play offered to Rich was *Pasquin*. (5) Coming back from his country residence, Fielding attempted to get use of a stage, Rich's, without having concluded on owning or managing a theatre by himself. (6) Rich's refusal to put on the piece was at least a cause,—was it a chief cause?—for Fielding's leasing the Little Theatre in the Hay-Market. (7) Now probably it was that Fielding introduced into the last two acts of *Pasquin* those passages attacking Rich and his "entertainments," that make up a part of *The Life and Death of Common Sense*. (8) Evidently the original play was considerably modified because of the feeling against Rich. (9) Apparently, then, the design at least, and perhaps a completed version of the original *Pasquin* was had by Fielding some months earlier than the date at which he is generally supposed to have had the extant modified from; and evidently the design and the earlier version were in many respects markedly different from the design and the matter of the extant version.

(10) Angered by the satire in *Pasquin* performed on and after March 5, Rich determined to put on, perhaps he himself wrote ("Whether this was written by your command or your assistance, or only acted by your permission, I will not venture to decide," says the dedication to *Tumble-Down Dick*), *Marforio*, a satire partly on *Pasquin*. The satire was actually

played April 10, as we have seen. (11) The following will show that the matter and the purpose of *Marforio* were known in advance of its performance, and that the piece was brought out in the midst of controversy. In the *Daily Post* of April 10 appears a notice by "The Author of *Marforio*":

"An Extract from the PROMPTER of Yesterday.

'Several Correspondents (sic) have inform'd me that the Author of MARFORIO, a Farce which is to be acted To-morrow Night at Covent Garden Theatre, not contented to attack (a little of the soonest) the Reputation of PASQUIN before it is printed and consequently before it can equitably be a Subject for Censure, has also, in a Manner that no Humour can justify, no Wit find necessary, descended to mistake, as a Subject for SATIRE, the Design of the Prompter to promote a good Taste among Actors, and an Inclination in Audiences to distinguish and encourage them.'

To the Author of the PROMPTER.

SIR,

In what Manner this Piece, call'd MARFORIO, has been represented to you, I know not, for in your subsequent Paragraphs you intimate that this little Dramatic Performance is an Insult on Humanity as well as Common Sense; and that instead of Humour, there is Scurrility, and instead of Wit, Personal Slander; . . . As for making Retrenchments, which you advise me to at the close of your Paper, I cannot consent; I know of nothing there is in the whole Piece to give a just Offence. . . .

As to your charge of my attacking the Reputation of PASQUIN unequivocally, because it was not printed when I wrote MARFORIO, I only answer; Those who have been the Spectators of PASQUIN will be the most proper Judges, whether I have done my Witty Brother any Injustice, and I heartily desire they would all attend this Night: If I have taken a little Liberty with him, he himself cannot be angry when he has taken an unbounded Liberty with all Ranks of Men; . . . As for my Cause, I shall submit it this Night to the Gentlemen in the Pit, and from their Arbitration shall make no Appeal.

The Author of MARFORIO."

Apparently, as Fielding suggests in the dedication to *Tumble-Down Dick*, the "Arbitrators" damned the play. I find no notices of its performance during the rest of April, and apparently (as we have seen) it was not printed.

(12) Possibly knowledge of Rich's purpose hastened the publication of *Pasquin*, which on April 6 was announced for the 8th, but which,

perhaps, had not been issued by the night of the 8th when at latest was composed the *Prompter* article of the 9th. (13) Irritated by Rich's project and catching opportunity for advertisement and "more matter," Fielding, before *Marforio* was acted, determined to attack his opponent in another play. (14) As we have seen, on February 28 and during March, Rich had produced at Drury Lane "*The Fall of Phaeton*, Interspers'd with a grotesque Pantomime call'd *Harlequin A Captive*." Catching up the subject and the fact of Rich's fame as Harlequin and as a producer of "Entertainments," Fielding wrote probably early in April "*Tumble-Down Dick*; or, *Phaeton in the Suds*, Interlarded with Foolish Comic Interludes, call'd Harlequin a Pick-Pocket." (15) Recognizing the opportunity for alleged unfair criticism that his defender in the *Prompter* voiced on the 9th, as given by the delay of over a month in publishing *Pasquin*, Fielding prepared "copy" of *Tumble-Down Dick* and wrote the dedication for publication in April (as we have seen) probably simultaneously with the first performance. The failure of *Marforio* made actually unnecessary the hurrying on of the play, which was consequently delayed till the end of the month.

I may add that these facts that I have presented may account beyond mere opposition to the nature of Rich's performances, for some of Fielding's persistent hostility toward Rich evinced in his continued attacks on the manager in the *Champion* of 1739-40, and for the matter, some of it in phrasing similar to that in the *Champion*,<sup>3</sup> in *Jonathan Wild*, Book III, Chapter XI, published in 1743.

JOHN EDWIN WELLS.

Beloit College.

## A SCIENTIFIC BASIS FOR METRICS

If science is to play any part in the study of verse, it is of primary importance that the terms used should be defined precisely and without contradiction in order that propositions concerning these terms should have a meaning. With this in view, let us limit our discussion so as to treat only of verse read aloud, concerning ourselves primarily not with the poet but with the reader.

In verse, as in prose, we consider the sound of syllables, words, and rhetorical phrases, but in verse we must consider a new force, meter, with which prose is not concerned. Now, strangely enough, I can find no serviceable set of definitions for the terms used in the study of metrics. The important terms are either undefined, or defined so as to involve contradictions, or defined with reference to what is seen on the page or what ought to be heard rather than what is heard. For the sake of a scientific treatment, I shall propose a consistent set of exact definitions, expressed in terms that concern the ear of the reader.

And, to show the need of such a set of definitions, let us first examine certain other sets. In Saintsbury's<sup>1</sup> set, for example, the important terms are frankly undefined. *Rhythm* is called "an orderly arrangement of sounds." If we ask "What sort of orderly arrangement" we learn "Certain (given) arrangements of 'long' and 'short' syllables." If we ask, "What are long and short syllables," we learn only that a long syllable is not short and that a short syllable is not long. Then, as far as the definitions go, any syllable may be long and any other short, and practically any passage may be considered rhythmic, no matter how it is read.

On the other hand, if we strive to be scientific and define our terms with precision, we are in great danger of pronouncing contradictions. In Bright and Miller's *Elements of English Versification*<sup>2</sup> we find this definition

<sup>3</sup> See my articles on *Fielding's Political Purpose* in "*Jonathan Wild*," in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, March, 1913, pages 36-8, and on "*The Champion*" and "*Jonathan Wild*" soon to appear.

<sup>1</sup> George Saintsbury, *Historical Manual of English Prosody*, The Macmillan Co., 1910, pp. 291, 287.

<sup>2</sup> Ginn and Co., 1910.